

HF
1754
C18f

A
A
0
0
1
1
6
5
0
0
7
4



UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

THE

FRENCH AND AMERICAN TARIFFS COMPARED;

IN A

SERIES OF LETTERS

ADDRESSED TO

MONS. MICHEL CHEVALIER,

MEMBER OF THE COUNCIL OF STATE, ETC. ETC.

BY

HENRY C. CAREY.

PHILADELPHIA:

COLLINS, PRINTER, 705 JAYNE STREET.

1861.

HF
no 1754
C 13

LETTERS TO MONS. MICHEL CHEVALIER.

LETTER FIRST.

MY DEAR SIR:

At the close of our last interview, now little more than two years since, you did me the favor of presenting me with two reports which had just then been made to the Council of State, in reference to a proposed consolidation, in the form of law, of sundry decrees by which changes had been made in the conditions upon which foreign merchandise might be received in France—the two subjects therein specially referred to being the duties on long wools, and upon iron pipes. The committees had been composed of gentlemen distinguished by their familiarity with the needs of agriculture and of commerce, and with those of the public works. At their head had been placed the most confidential of all the advisers of the emperor, the government thus manifesting its sense of the extreme importance of the questions to whose examination their attention had been invited. On his part that sense was manifested by his constant presence, and by his own most careful examination of witnesses with a view to satisfy himself in regard to the *one great question* which appears to have been ever present in his mind—that of the absolute necessity for maintaining the duties at such rates as should be fully and completely protective of that great domestic industry which, under a system even more thoroughly protective than that of Great Britain had ever been, had given to France a foreign commerce four times greater than had existed thirty years before, and had added so largely to the value of the land and labor of the empire. At every stage of the examination, the views of the committees, and most especially those of their presiding officer, appear to have been in entire accordance with those so well expressed by yourself in one of your most recent works—your readers having there been told—

That “every nation owed it to itself to seek the establishment of diversification in the pursuits of its people, as Germany and England had already done in regard to cottons and woollens,

and as France herself had done in reference to so many, and so widely different departments of industry :”

That “when it failed to do so it made a great mistake :”

That “combination of varied effort was not only promotive of general prosperity, but was the one and only condition of national progress ;” and,

That to favor the production of such combination was not only “not an abuse of power on the part of the government,” but was, on the contrary, the mere “accomplishment of that positive duty which required it so to act, at each epoch in the progress of the nation, as to favor the taking possession of all the branches of industry whose acquisition was authorized by the nature of things ;” governments being, in your view, “only the personification of nations, and it being required of them that they should exercise their influence in the direction indicated by the general interest properly studied and fully appreciated.”¹

Than this, nothing as I conceive could be more accurate, it being a full indorsement of the views of that first of all the statesmen the world has yet produced, your countryman Colbert. Hume urged upon the nation the necessity for such a course of action as should “preserve its people and its manufactures.” The essential object of Adam Smith’s great work was the enforcement upon his countrymen of the idea, that development of the domestic commerce was the necessary prelude to an advantageous foreign trade. J. B. Say taught his hearers that “protection granted with a view to promote the profitable application of labor and capital, might be productive of universal benefit.” Blanqui assured his readers that past experience had proved “that a people ought never to deliver over to the chances of foreign trade the fate of its manufactures.” Rossi held it to be undeniable that there were exceptions to the free trade principle, and that “in the conduct of a nation,” as in that of a family, sacrifices needed to be made in the hope of thereby opening “new roads to affluence.” Following in the same direction, Mr. J. S. Mill arrived at the conclusion, that individuals should not be expected at their own risk, or rather certain loss, to introduce new branches of manufacture, or “to bear the burden of carrying them on until workmen should have been educated to the level of those with whom the processes had become traditional ;” and that, therefore, protective duties might be resorted to as the least inconvenient mode of trying such experiments. So far, all these distinguished teachers have been certainly in the right, but in the enunciation of their views there has generally been exhibited a timidity which contrasts most unfavorably with your own frank and manly indorsement of the idea, that “in

¹ Examen du Système Commerciale connu sous le nom du Système Protecteur. Paris, 1852, pp. 34 to 38.

every country, the day of maturity having arrived, there arises a necessity in the interests even of civilization for acclimating among its people the principal branches of manufacture," and that its government is then "well inspired when seeking the establishment, among its people, of diversity in the demand for human service"—that diversity being "favorable to the advancement of knowledge," and altogether in harmony with the capabilities of widely extended territories like those of France, Germany, and the United States.

French practice, as shown in the proceedings of the Council of State, of which you are yourself so influential a member, and your own teachings, as well as those of the distinguished economists to whom I have referred, being thus in such perfect harmony with each other, it was with great surprise I read, shortly after the interview above referred to, that you were then arranging the terms of a treaty with Great Britain in which the free trade doctrines, so pertinaciously urged by that country on the world's acceptance, were to be reduced to practice. That such should prove to be the case appeared to me to be entirely incredible, and glad was I, when the treaty came, to find that I had been right, its essential characteristics having then proved to be:—

I. A resolute assertion of efficient and complete protection, at whatsoever cost of revenue:

II. A nicety of discrimination with a view to meet the actual needs of French industry, such as is almost without a parallel in the world:

III. A determination to render the collection of those duties certain, manifested by the almost universal rejection of the *ad valorem* system provided for in the former free trade treaty with Great Britain, when France was flooded with British manufactures, invoiced at a third or even a fourth of their real value; and

IV. A determination to secure to French industry a full supply of raw materials, manifested by a great reduction of the duties upon them, even where they had not been entirely abolished.

To call a tariff so distinguished a free trade one, in the British sense of the word, would be a manifest absurdity—there being no single part of it that is not in perfect accordance with the assurance given to his countrymen, some few years since, by Mons. Baroche, then President of the Council, that while it was proposed to abolish "antiquated prohibitions," the government had determined that the principle of protection should be firmly and steadily maintained. That of free trade, as he further told them, had been formally rejected, as incompatible with the independence and security of the nation, and as likely to be destructive of its noblest manufactures. The decision of the Council then announced, has now, as we see, taken the form of law, by means

of a treaty to which your name is not attached, but which is said to have been mainly negotiated by yourself, and in which your own principles are so fully carried into practice as to warrant the admiration of all who believe in the necessity for bringing the plough, the loom, and the anvil, to work together.

Under a system of protection more efficient and more steadily maintained than any other the world had seen, your countrymen had placed themselves at the head of the commercial communities of the world, their exports having grown from an average of 500,000,000, in the period from 1825 to 1836, to 1,900,000,000 in 1856, and five-sixths probably of that vast amount being composed of the products of their own soil, so condensed in form, agreeably to the ideas so admirably propounded by Adam Smith, as to enable the food, the wool, the rags, the silk, the fuel, and the ore, to travel cheaply and freely to the remotest corners of the world.¹ Under that system land and labor had much increased in value, while the government had greatly increased in strength, power, and influence. Nevertheless, firm as were the foundations upon which then rested the whole of that industrial system for which the country had been indebted to the protective policy inaugurated by Colbert, you, my dear sir, had deemed it necessary still to maintain protection at such a point as would give to your own people the entire control of their domestic market. Such having been the case, the friends of protection here had reason, as they thought, for supposing that our recent re-adoption of the protective principle, would meet with your entire approval, as a measure calculated to increase the productiveness of our agriculture—to give value to American land and labor—and to increase our power to contribute to the comfort, convenience, and prosperity of your countrymen. So much the reverse of this, however, has been the case, that we find in recent journals, in the report of proceedings at the Dublin meeting of the Social Science Association, a denunciation of the tariff of the present year, in the following words:—

“As you are all here practical men, seeing with pleasure and thankfulness the good which appears, but not shutting your eyes to avoid perceiving the evil, by the side of those happy changes which are under accomplishment or in preparation, you will not fail to observe the facts which are taking place in the opposite direction. It is thus that by the side of the treaty of commerce between France and England your glance is arrested with pain by the Morrill tariff, which the Northern United States have recently adopted. But the Morrill tariff is born of the war.

¹ The exports of what is called British merchandise are larger in amount, but they are almost entirely composed of food and other raw materials brought from other parts of the world, to be converted. Great Britain stands at the head of trading nations, but France is chief of the commercial ones.

It is the child of discord. It will not live. The atmosphere of the nineteenth century will stifle it; for the atmosphere of the nineteenth century only suits products of another nature, of a more regular character, more conformable to the laws of harmony, and to the unconquerable want which the nations feel to interchange the fruits of their labor. One of the finest sciences that man has formed, Geology, teaches and proves to us that in proportion as during the series of the ages of the earth the atmosphere purified itself and was tempered, there were seen to appear more perfect creatures. The animals of the first times, those monstrous and hideous beings of which the forms, recovered and described by learned men, astonish and terrify us, gave place to animals less strange and more beautiful, of an organization more elegant and more refined. The Morrill tariff is like one of those ugly beasts, such as the Anoplotherium, or the Plesiosaurus, which one should attempt to rear upon the earth such as it is to-day. Vain attempt! Powerless effort! The Morrill tariff is destined soon to perish in the midst of the confusion of its authors."

That you fully believed all this, no one, my dear sir, who has had the pleasure of knowing you, can even for a moment doubt. That, however, you have wholly misconceived the character of the measure thus denounced—that it is far less protective, and therefore far less in accordance with your own most excellent teachings, than is that one of which you are said to be the author—that it is far more of a mere revenue measure than you yourself might wish it should be—that it totally fails in that nicety of discrimination by which your own is so much distinguished—that it, therefore, throws far less difficulty in the way of international exchanges—that it abounds in those ad valorem duties by which protection is rendered less efficient—that that efficiency is still further diminished by the retention of more and heavier duties on raw materials—I propose to show, in another letter, fully convinced that, as a lover of truth, you will gladly receive the correction, and as gladly aid in disabusing the public mind of Europe in reference to the charge so often made, that the North had sought to profit of the present disturbances by giving to the world a tariff monster of which it had reason to feel ashamed.

Meantime, my dear sir, I pray you to accept the assurance of the sincere respect with which I remain,

Yours, faithfully,
HENRY C. CAREY.

MONS. MICHEL CHEVALIER.

PHILADELPHIA, October 26, 1861.

LETTER SECOND.

DEAR SIR :

As preparatory to the examination above proposed, I now ask your attention to the following comparative view of the duties payable under the Morrill tariff—the character of which you have so exceedingly misconceived—and that Reciprocity tariff, which you regard as likely so much to “benefit both France and the United Kingdom,” and as ultimately “destined to metamorphose the custom-houses of the world.” •

NAMES OF ARTICLES.	Quantities.	French duties under	
		the Reciprocity treaty in American Money.	U. S. duties under the Morrill tariff.
Iron, pig, and old cast iron	ton.	\$4 39	\$6 00
Iron, old broken wrought	ton.	6 35	6 00
Iron, bar	ton.	13 68	15 00
Iron, railroad	ton.	13 68	12 00
Iron, sheet	ton.	25 41 to \$31 28	20 to \$25
Iron manufactures; pipes and solid columns	ton.	8 30	11 20
Iron manufac.; heavy wrought	ton.	17 58	20 00
Iron manufactures; small wares	ton.	29 32	22 40
Iron manufactures; cut nails	cwt.	97 $\frac{3}{4}$ c.	1 12
Iron manufactures; wr't nails	cwt.	1 46 $\frac{1}{2}$	2 24
Iron manufactures; anchors, chains, cables	ton.	19 54	30 to \$33
Iron manufactures; tubes of wrought iron, large	ton.	25 40	44 80
Iron manufactures; tubes of wrought iron, small	ton.	48 85	44 80
Steel in bars of all kinds	lb.	1 3-10c.	1 $\frac{1}{4}$ and 2 c.
Steel in sheets above 1-12th of an inch thick	lb.	2c.	2 c. and 15 $\frac{7}{8}$ c.
Steel in sheets under 1-12th of an inch thick	lb.	2 $\frac{5}{8}$ c.	2 $\frac{1}{2}$ and 15 $\frac{7}{8}$ c.
Steel tools in pure steel	lb.	3 $\frac{1}{2}$ c.	30 $\frac{7}{8}$ cent.
Steel sewing needles	lb.	8 $\frac{3}{4}$ to 17 $\frac{1}{2}$ c.	20 $\frac{7}{8}$ cent.
Steel pens	lb.	8 $\frac{3}{4}$ c.	30 $\frac{7}{8}$ cent.
Steel cutlery	lb.	20 $\frac{7}{8}$ cent.	30 $\frac{7}{8}$ cent.
Steel firearms	lb.	21 c.	30 $\frac{7}{8}$ cent.
Tin, pure beaten and rolled	ton.	11 72	10 $\frac{7}{8}$ cent.
Tin, pots and pans	ton.	58 62	56 00
Lead, pigs, bars, plates	ton.	5 86	22 40
Lead, in sheets	ton.	9 77	33 60
Plated manufactures of all kinds	ton.	195 45	30 $\frac{7}{8}$ cent.

	Quantities.	French duties under the Reciprocity treaty in American Money.	U. S. duties under the Morrill tariff.
Clocks and watches . . .		5 ¢ cent.	30 ¢ cent.
Clocks and movements . . . lb.		9c.	15 ¢ cent.
Ores, iron, copper, zinc, lead, tin, nickel		free	
Locomotive engines . . . ton.		\$29 32	\$33 60
Spinning machines . . . ton.		29 22	30 ¢ cent.
Leather, prepared skins, morocco lb.		22	10 to 30 ¢ ct.
Leather manufactures . . . ad val.		10 ¢ cent.	30 ¢ cent.
Refined sugar . . . lb.		3½ cts.	2 cts.
Molasses		1 1-5 cts.	2 cts. ¾ gal.
Linen, plain, unbleached, (7 grades) lb.		2½ to 35 cts.	25 ¢ cent.
Linen, bleached, dyed, or printed (7 grades) lb.		3½ to 47 cts.	30 ¢ cent.
Cotton tissues, plain, twilled } ticks, unbleached, weigh- ing 3½ oz. or more to sq. yd. }	100 sq. yd.	\$1	\$1
Cotton tissues, weighing 2 to 3½ oz. to sq. yd.	100 sq. yd.	2 cts.	\$2 to \$3.
Cotton tissues, weighing 1 to 2 oz. to sq. yd.	100 sq. yd.	¼ ct.	4 00
Cotton tissues, bleached, add to unbleached		15 ¢ cent.	add ½c. sq. yd.
Cotton tissue, printed . . . ad val.		15 ¢ cent.	{ add to bleached 10 ¢ ct.
Raw cotton		free	free
Flax and hemp ton.		\$9 77	\$10, \$15, & \$35
Wool, unmanufactured		free	3 and 9 cts.
Tissues of pure wool . . . ad val.		15 ¢ cent.	{ 25, 30 ¢ ct., 12 c. ¾ lb., & 25 ¢ ct.
Silk in cocoons		free	free
Silk tissues, hosiery, lace, pure		free	25 and 30 ¢ ct.
India-rubber wearing apparel . . lb.		15 c.	20 and 25 ¢ ct.
India-rubber boots and shoes . . lb.		7½ c.	20 ¢ cent.
Cordage, cables, fish-nets . . lb.		2½ c.	2 and 3 cts.
Beer, in addition to internal tax gal.		1¼ c.	15 c.
Glassware and table glass . . lb.		3.8 c. & 10 ¢ ct.	25 ¢ cent.
Window glass, plain, plate, unpolished lb.		3.8 c. & 10 ¢ ct.	1 to 4c. sq. foot.
Glass, cut lb.		3.8 c. & 10 ¢ ct.	30 ¢ cent.

The British free-trade policy looks to maintaining the Custom House system as a permanent source of revenue. Your Council of State, wholly rejecting the question of revenue, decided to have a tariff that should, in accordance with lessons that you yourself had taught, stimulate domestic commerce, and thereby give to labor and land that increase of value to which alone they could look for power to support the burden of direct taxation. Precisely such a tariff as that they asked for, is presented to us in the one a portion of which is given above—the idea of revenue

being most rigidly excluded, and that of protection being never in any manner allowed to be vitiated by it. Pig iron—which has in France the character of a raw material, sufficient domestic supplies of which can scarcely be obtained—and pipes—are admitted at a rate of duty rather lower than our own, whereas on finished commodities into which the pigs can be converted, they are materially higher. Thus, railroad bars pay \$13.68 against our \$12, while sheet iron, as employing more labor than the bars, pays six times as much as pigs, and one-fourth more than is paid under the Morrill tariff. On steel, generally, the duties are about on a par with ours, while the raw material required for its manufacture is admitted at a lower rate than here. On cutlery 20 per cent. appears to have been regarded as sufficient, whereas 30 per cent. has been so regarded here. Tin is lower than with us, but manufactures of tin are higher—the protective principle being every where most effectually carried out. Plated wares are in effect prohibited. The charge on locomotives nearly resembles our own. Linen manufactures are higher, while flax and hemp are admitted at greatly lower rates of duty. The Morrill tariff increases the rates on cotton directly in the ratio of their fineness, which properly meets the condition of the manufacture here; whereas you, my dear sir, to meet a very different condition of things, put a duty of one cent per square yard upon the coarsest unbleached, and only one-seventieth of a cent per square yard on the very finest. This, of course, is because your countrymen can safely defy competition in the most delicate textures, and need only to resist the English importations of the coarsest. Again: in the matter of printed cottons, instead of running up an arithmetical climax of duties upon the unbleached, colored, and printed, of all grades of fineness and labor cost, as is the case in our tariff, yours fits your own industrial conditions by heavy duties on the lowest and the highest in our scale, while guarding the prints, as it does the coarse unbleached, by an amply protective rate, but leaving the finer intermediate unprinted goods, in which England cannot rival them, nearly exempt from duty—protection ruling the rates everywhere, without regard to valuation.

On glassware, mirrors, and plate, 3 8-10 cents per pound and 10 per cent. must give the most complete protection against England, notwithstanding her late improvements. Glass showing its qualities clearly, the fine products of France are in no danger of being matched in market price by inferior goods. As in the case of cutlery, the purchaser can judge of what he buys, and the best article of the kind will hold the market against all rivalry. Again, on cordage and cables—the average of duties in your tariff is as high as in ours—the rates of duty here, as throughout the schedules, being in the measure of the threatened competition—always protective, and never turning aside for any other object.

Having studied all these facts, you will, as I feel assured, admit that you have been entirely misled in regard to the Morrill tariff, and that it is, so far as regards the sacrifice of revenue to protection, infinitely less perfect than is your own.

Coming, now, to the second point to which I have desired to invite your attention—that of the nicety of classification required for giving to each and every branch of manufacture the precise protection that it needs—we find the only case of the kind in the Morrill tariff to be that of cottons, and that even there the discriminations are absolutely as nothing when compared to those of the one to which you point as likely to produce a revolution in the commercial system of the world. Linens are by us disposed of in two short lines, and both of these are *ad valorem*. Woollen yarns have three lines where you have no less than thirty-six; and the only counting of threads that is required by us is that of four qualities of cotton, with a variety of duties as easy of calculation as is the counting of your fingers. Our whole tariff is, indeed, simplicity itself when compared with the classification of your own, in which there are no less than *one hundred and forty kinds of cotton yarn, each with its separate rate of duty!* Flax and hemp yarns, single unbleached, single bleached or dyed, and twisted unbleached, twisted bleached or dyed, are put into twenty-four classes, and under as many different rates of duty. Linens have twenty-four descriptions, determined by the number of threads, ranging from 8 to 24 threads to five square millimetres—these varieties being run through the several conditions of unbleached, bleached, printed, and figured, with the duties varied in every case; the lowest at 30 francs and the highest at 535 francs per 100 kilogrammes (220 pounds avoirdupois). Jute yarns and tissues stand in the tables in equally numerous descriptions and varied duties; and in cottons the classification is carried to the extent of providing different rates for fifteen qualities of single unbleached yarns, fifteen of bleached, fifteen of dyed, forty-five kinds or qualities of twisted in two strands, two kinds of yarn of three threads, and forty-five kinds of warped yarns, with the duties varied, according to fineness, as has been already said, no less than 140 times—beginning with ten centimes and rising to no less than three francs per kilogramme, or about one-quarter of a dollar per pound. Of the cotton tissues, I have given in the table only the coarsest, the medium, and the finest qualities. In the schedule there are eight qualities, the description of one of which will serve as a specimen of the whole. It reads thus: “Cotton tissues weighing 11 kilogrammes or more the 100 square metres, of 35 threads or less to the 5 square millimetres, 50 centimes per kilogramme.” Had any such discrimination been attempted here, we should have been assured that the object of the framers of our tariff had been the utter annihilation of international intercourse, and there would have been a howl

among our British free traders such as could have found no parallel in the history of the world since the establishment of the first custom-house.

The great superiority of your tariff in regard to the careful discrimination required for rendering thoroughly efficient the protection proposed to be accorded, being thus established, we may now, for a moment, turn to the third point of difference to which I have invited your attention. There, too, we find protection more complete, wool being admitted free, while with us it is subjected to duties of three and nine cents per pound—and flax and hemp paying less than ten dollars per ton, while by the Morrill tariff they are subjected to duties ranging from ten to thirty-five dollars per ton.

In all this there is surely nothing of the free trade so strongly commended to the world by our British friends. On the contrary, it is most efficiently protective throughout its schedules, every part of which is varied in precise accordance with the conditions and requirements of French industry, and in accordance with the previous assurances of Mons. Baroche, when speaking as the organ of the Council of State, and of the Emperor himself. It is called the Cobden treaty, but it should assuredly, my dear sir, bear your name, my deliberate opinion of it being that it is more perfectly in accordance with your previous assertion of the duties of a government than any treaty that had ever before been negotiated. The history of the world presents no record of the existence of any customs tariff conforming so exactly to the wants of a community, maintaining legitimate protection with such entire and absolute efficiency. Would to Heaven that we had statesmen who could give us precisely such an one! Compared with it the Morrill tariff is a construction of a kind so rude, that we have almost reason to feel ashamed of having presented it to the world as a protective measure.

Believing, my dear sir, that you must now be quite convinced that the great error of the Morrill tariff, when compared with your own, is to be found in its mistaken liberality towards foreign nations, I now propose to ask, for a moment, your attention to a brief comparison of some of its provisions with those of that general tariff which long has governed, and, as I believe, still governs, the intercourse between this country and your own. The one says to the people of France—"Bring us all the products of your soil, or of those of any other country of the world. Put upon them as much labor as you please—change their form in whatsoever manner may be most agreeable to you—and we will admit them all on the payment of duties rarely exceeding thirty per cent.—those duties, too, being charged on the *ad valorem* principle, by means of which you have generally been able to reduce them to little more than twenty per cent."

The other says to the people of this country—"Bring us wheat and cotton, coal and ores, rags or hemp, pipe clay, wool, hides, and all other of the rudest products of your soil and labor, and we will accept them at nominal rates of duty; but beware of doing anything whatsoever towards changing them in form. Labor abounds with us, and it is our first duty to find employment for it, and thus make a market on the land for all the products of the farm. On no condition whatsoever will we admit your cotton, after you shall have converted it into cloth, or your hides, after you shall have changed them into leather—there being a determination on our part that you *shall not* follow the advice of Adam Smith in converting food and wool, or food and hides, with a view to facilitation of their transport to any part of France. Should you undertake to send us your food and rags in the form of paper, the product shall be admitted only on payment of eight or ten cents per pound. Should you send food and clay in the form of stone ware, the tax shall be eight or ten cents per pound; and, further, if you send your food, limestone, coal, and iron ore, in the form of a railroad bar, you shall pay from twenty to thirty dollars per ton for the privilege of selling it in any of our domestic markets. The first duty of a government is to provide employment for its people, and that duty we mean shall fully be performed.

"Further even than this, should you send us tobacco, we pray you to recollect that we limit you to a single great purchaser, with the express desire to buy it as cheaply as possible, and to sell it at the highest prices. The higher we sell it, the larger must be our profits, but the smaller must be the demand for the raw commodity, and the lower must be the price at which you will be required to sell it. In this manner we shall add very many millions to our public revenue, no small portion of which you will be required to pay, and thus shall we compel you to contribute to the support of the fleets and armies required for our defence."

Such, my dear sir, is the language of France to America, and it is to such dictation as this that the latter has to this hour submitted. That it should so have done is, as you must admit, most wonderful. That such submission, altogether at war, as it is, with the teachings of Adam Smith, and with those of all the eminent men to whom I have referred, yourself included, should have resulted in discord among our people, is only what might naturally have been expected, and what I have for many years predicted. Let us hope for better things, now that we have made one slight step, and a very slight one indeed it is, towards re-establishing among ourselves a policy more in accordance with that established for France by the treaty recently so well concluded.

As regards the objects sought to be attained, there is not even a shadow of difference between this latter and its predecessor. Both look carefully to the one great end of promoting diversification in the employment of your people, regarding it as necessary to the development of that great internal commerce in the absence of which there can be none of that continuity in the demand for human service which is so essential to growth in wealth, civilization, power, and influence. Widely different, however, are they in their modes of operation—the one accomplishing by means of careful discrimination more than previously had been obtained by aid of prohibition. Such, however, are the changes everywhere observed—the skilful surgeon of our day accomplishing, by little more than the turn of his finger, operations that to *Ambrose Paré*, great as he certainly was, but working with the poorest instruments, were wholly impracticable without severe exertion of mere brute force. Your tariff is on a level with the surgery of the present day, whereas the one of which you have now complained is so defective when compared with it, as scarcely to be above the level of that of the days of *Paré* and the League.

Believing, my dear sir, that you can scarcely fail to find, in the facts that have been submitted for your consideration, conclusive evidence that you have been seriously misled in your estimate of our recent course of action, and that you will be disposed to agree with me in the idea that better to suit our tariff to “the atmosphere of the nineteenth century,” we should follow your example in making it more, and not less, protective of the land and labor of the country, I remain, with great regard,

Yours, faithfully,

HENRY C. CAREY.

MONS. MICHEL CHEVALIER.

PHILADELPHIA, October 28, 1860.

LETTER THIRD.

DEAR SIR :—

As has been seen, your tariff is, in most respects, far more in accordance than is our own, with the ideas you have so well expressed in regard to “the positive duty of governments so to act at each epoch of the nation’s progress as to favor the taking possession of all the branches of industry whose acquisition is authorized by the nature of things”—there being, as I conceive, no case on record, in which an economist, become a statesman, has so completely reduced to practice the theories he before had taught. In one most important respect, however, our tariff is greatly more defensible, upon the principles you have so well enunciated, than is your own, as I propose now to show you.

The essential object of protection is that of bringing about such combination of action as will make demand for all the varieties of human power, both physical and mental, and for all the rude products of the earth—“agriculture alone,” to use your own words, “being insufficient,” and there arising in every country a necessity, in the interests of human progress, for adding thereto all the principal branches of industry, from the making of cottons and woollens to the working of metals and of mines, and to the arts of navigation. “To that point,” in your view, “the programme is certainly right ;” but “Nature,” as you have further said—

“Has herself determined the limits beyond which this diversification may not be carried. It would be absurd for England, or for Northern Germany, to endeavor to produce at home the wines they drink ; for us to try to raise the cotton we spin, weave, and print ; for Italy to pretend to draw from herself the ice with which she seeks, in the heat of summer, to cool her thirst ; for Western Europe to impose upon itself a necessity for drawing from its own poor mines its supplies of the precious metals ; or for France to refuse to manufacture any tin, copper, or zinc, but those yielded by its own particular mines. When nature, in her caprice, has refused to a country so extensive as our own an abundance of ores and fuel, it would then be an absurdity for it to insist upon supplying all its wants from the few little veins of coal, or meagre deposits of ores, that have been scattered over it.”

Such is the completion of your own programme, every part of which has, as you may rest assured, the most hearty indorsement of every friend of the system of which you have here shown yourself the earnest advocate, from the shores of our northern lakes to

the Gulf of Mexico, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific. It *would* be absurd for us of the North to attempt to raise our own cotton, our spices, or our oranges. Equally absurd would it be for Cuba or Louisiana to attempt to raise rye or wheat, for with every step there would be an increase of difficulty in obtaining the supplies required. Directly the reverse of this, however, must be the case with those whose soils and climates are fitted for the production of cotton or of wheat, or with those others who have fuel and ore in great abundance—protection being there sought with a view to facilitate the conversion of food and cotton into cloth, or fuel and ore into iron, thereby creating demand for human power, physical and intellectual, and producing that “combination of varied effort” so properly regarded by yourself as not only “promotive of prosperity,” but as being the one and only “condition of national progress.” Protection, therefore, may with great propriety be resorted to when it is in accordance with “the nature of things,” but never otherwise. Such, my dear sir, being the test you have yourself established, we may now proceed to an examination of the question whether your tariff or our own is most defensible when so considered.

France has food, labor power, and intelligence, three of the raw materials required for the production of cotton cloth, but she is short of fuel and wholly deficient in the wool—no cotton being there produced. Determined, however, to profit of those she has, she protects the cotton manufacture, in the treaty that you are said to have negotiated, by a series of provisions so elaborate as to be a cause of wonder to all of us Americans who have had a chance to study them, and by her general tariff actually prohibiting the producers of cotton in India and America from sending their product in any form but that in which it must be sure to make a market for all the raw materials she herself can furnish. Fully successful as she has been in securing to herself the control of her own supplies, she yet maintains protection at its highest point, and in its most perfect form, with a view to enable her to supply the world with her own food and her own labor in the shape of cloths and silks—doing this to such extent that she now stands foremost in the list of nations as the largest exporter of domestic food, domestic labor, and high intelligence. That she is right in this, no one can doubt. That others are wrong in not following her great example is a fact about which there can be as little question.

Looking next to the country that has given to the world the much-abused Morrill tariff, we find food in such abundance that a bushel of corn may now be bought in Iowa for less money than is required to pay for a single yard of the coarsest cotton cloth—in which labor power is so abundant that more than half of it is wasted in the absence of demand for its employment—in which

intelligence so much abounds that most of the great improvements of recent times have there originated—in which fuel abounds to an extent unknown elsewhere—and, finally, in which cotton grows so freely that it might with ease be made to supply the entire demand of the world—all the raw materials of cotton cloth thus existing there to an extent to which the world affords no parallel whatsoever.

Such being the condition of these two countries in regard to cotton and its products, which of the two, my dear sir, is acting most in accordance with your own principles in granting the protection required for taking possession of the cotton manufacture? Is it France that is so much deficient in fuel, and so wholly deficient in cotton? Or, is it this country, that has both, and that has, in addition, all that France possesses? As it seems to me, you can scarcely fail to admit that it is the latter, and that you have been much in error in denouncing as erroneous the feeble attempt that has been made in the Morrill tariff to follow in your footsteps. Should you desire any evidence of this, let me beg you to turn to Adam Smith and re-peruse his admirable exhibit of the advantages resulting from combining tons of food and hundred weights of wool in the form of cloth—thereby enabling both to travel freely and cheaply to the remotest corners of the world.

As regards iron, the case is, as I think, equally strong—France being largely deficient in both fuel and ore, while this country abounds in both to an extent unequalled in any portion of the earth. By your own tariff, nevertheless, pig iron is loaded with a protective duty seven-tenths as great as that complained of in the Morrill tariff. Make it even ten times greater, and France could not then supply herself; whereas, under even the present moderate duty, this country could, in a brief period, supply all the demands of the thousand millions of the human race.

Passing upwards from the pig to the bar, and thence to the various commodities made from iron, the case becomes yet stronger, labor and fuel being the only raw materials then required to be used. Of the last, France has but little, and yet, because she has the first, you impose duties far higher than our own. Should not the course of operation, my dear sir, be directly the reverse of this, our government imposing high duties with a view to the development of our vast internal wealth, and France opening her ports for the reception of American labor, food, coal, and ore, whenever they took the form of iron? That to do so would, with both our nations, be quite in accordance with your own most excellent programme, you must, I think, admit. If so, have you not been much in error in denouncing the Morrill tariff as “a child of discord”—as a monster that “will not live”—as a thing that must be stifled in the free “atmosphere of the nineteenth century,” and that “must perish in the midst of the confusion of its authors”—and which

is yet in an almost infinite degree less protective of the material interests of the country than is your own? The more you shall study the subject, the more will you, I think, be disposed to arrive at the conclusion, that our real error is to be found in the fact that we have, in past times, so much failed to follow in the footsteps of your countrymen, and that, even now, when we have professed to re-adopt your system, we have failed to take as a model the admirably protective treaty for which your country is understood to have been so much indebted to yourself.

Why, however, if all the raw materials are so cheap and abundant, should protection be here required? For the same reason that it has always been, and is now, after so very many years of thorough protection, still needed in France, as a means of defence against the barbarizing warfare described in the following extract from a report made to the British House of Commons, and printed by its order, but a few years since:—

“The laboring classes generally, in the manufacturing districts of this country, and especially in the iron and coal districts, are very little aware of the extent to which they are often indebted for their being employed at all to the immense *losses* which their employers voluntarily incur in bad times, in order to *destroy foreign competition, and to gain and keep possession of foreign markets*. Authentic instances are well known of employers having in such times carried on their works at a loss amounting in the aggregate to three or four hundred thousand pounds in the course of three or four years. If the efforts of those who encourage the combinations to restrict the amount of labor and to produce strikes were to be successful for any length of time, the great accumulations of capital could no longer be made *which enable a few of the most wealthy capitalists to overwhelm all foreign competition in times of great depression*, and thus to clear the way for the *whole trade* to step in when prices revive, and to carry on a great business before *foreign capital* can again accumulate to such an extent as to be able to establish a competition in prices with any chance of success. *The large capitals of this country are the great instruments of warfare against the competing capital of foreign countries, and are the most essential instruments now remaining by which our manufacturing supremacy can be maintained; the other elements—cheap labor, abundance of raw materials, means of communication, and skilled labor—being rapidly in process of being equalized.*”

England seeks to have raw materials at low prices, while aiming to have high prices for cloth and iron. That she may have both, she makes the terrible war above described, and thus prevents advance in civilization in all the countries subjected to her control. France protects herself against it, and has done so steadily, and your recent most excellent treaty furnishes proof conclusive that she means to do the same in all the future, knowing well that diversification of pursuits is “the condition of national progress” in strength, wealth, and civilization. The result is seen in the wonderful growth of her commerce, and in her most extraordinary advance in prosperity, power, and influence. This country, on the contrary, has, for the last fifteen years, permitted

the subjugation of its farmers and planters to a system under which they have been becoming daily more dependent upon British traders, and with precisely the same result that has been realized in every other country of the world that has been either unwilling or unable to protect itself against this worst of tyrannies—destruction of internal commerce—increasing weakness—and growing discord among the States, ending in civil war.

You, however, are disposed to look upon the Morrill tariff, poor a copy as it is of your own most admirable one, as “a child of discord.” Further reflection will, as I think, satisfy you, that the war now raging is but the legitimate child of that British free trade system which is so well described in the passage above presented for consideration. In proof that it is so, I venture to trespass a little further upon your time, to ask your attention to the following facts, without a knowledge of which it is scarcely possible to arrive at a correct conception of the causes of the unfortunate contest now pending between that portion of our people which does, and that which does not, believe in human slavery as an institution given of God, and to be perpetuated throughout the future.

The great backbone of the Union is found in the ridge of mountains which commences in Alabama, but little distant from the Gulf of Mexico, and extends northward, wholly separating the people who inhabit the low lands of the Atlantic slope from those who occupy such lands in the Mississippi valley, and itself constituting a great free soil wedge, with its attendant free atmosphere, created by nature herself in the very heart of slavery, and requiring but a slight increase of size and strength to enable those who now direct it to control the southern policy, and thus to bring the entire South into perfect harmony with the North and West, and with the world at large. That you may fully satisfy yourself on this head, I will now ask you to take the map and pass your eye down the Alleghany ridge, flanked as it is by the Cumberland range on the west, and by that of the Blue Mountains on the east, giving, in the very heart of the South itself, a country larger than all Great Britain, in which the finest of climates is found, in connection with the land abounding in coal, salt, limestone, iron ore, gold, and almost every other material required for the development of a varied industry, and for securing the attainment of the highest degree of agricultural wealth; and then to reflect that it is a region which must necessarily be occupied by men who, with their own hands till their own lands, and one in which slavery can never by any possibility have more than a slight and transitory existence. That done, I will ask of you here to reflect what would be now the condition of this country had its policy for the last fifteen years been such as would have tended towards *filling this great free soil wedge with free white*

northern men—miners, smelters, founders, machinists—workmen of all descriptions—who should have been making a market for every product of the farm, with constant increase in the value of land and labor, and as constantly growing tendency towards increase of freedom for all men, whether black or white? Would not, under such circumstances, power have made its way to the hills, and would not iron, coal, limestone, and copper have been enabled to dictate law to the cotton kings—to the men who live on the river bottoms, and live in ease at the cost of those of their fellow-men whom they buy and sell in the open market? Could we, by any possibility, have witnessed the present extraordinary state of things, had the policy of the country in reference to domestic and foreign commerce, in any manner resembled that admirable one which finds its best exemplification in that treaty of which you speak, and of which you are, to so great an extent, the author? Most assuredly we should not. To the British free trade system, against which you, my dear sir, have sought so carefully to guard your fellow-citizens, we owe our present discord; and that we do so owe it, you will, I feel assured, be prepared to admit, when you shall have carefully studied the facts that have been laid before you.

That it is in efficient protection we are to find the road towards freedom of trade, freedom of man, wealth, strength, power, peace, and civilization, is the lesson taught in those passages of your own work to which I have referred; and that it has proved to be the certain road, is the one that is taught in a portion of your recent address, to which, in another letter, I propose to invite your attention, remaining, meanwhile, with great regard and respect,

Yours, very truly,

HENRY C. CAREY.

MONS. MICHEL CHEVALIER.

PHILADELPHIA, October 30, 1861.

LETTER FOURTH.

DEAR SIR :—

The following is the passage of your Address referred to in my last, as furnishing proof conclusive that the policy of protection initiated by Colbert, steadily pursued by France, recently so ably advocated by yourself, and now so firmly established by the treaty you have made, is the true and only road towards domestic and foreign peace, towards the full development of human powers, and towards an ultimate entire freedom of international intercourse:—

“The treaty of commerce between the United Kingdom and France has already given occasion to a treaty of commerce between Belgium and France. In a few weeks probably it will have determined the signature of a treaty of commerce between France and the Zollverein, or at least between France and Prussia; for that treaty has already been for several months under negotiation. In a short time, I think I can assure you of it, we shall see concluded a treaty between France and that young kingdom, called to so glorious a future, which the noble and intelligent sword of the Emperor Napoleon the Third and the patriotic perseverance of Cavour have raised from the tomb in Italy. Each one of the States which has thus signed a treaty of commerce with France in consequence of the English treaty, or which will sign one, becomes a focus of propagation for free trade; and in treating itself with other States it determines them to propagate it around themselves. It is thus that the number of laborers in the vineyard of the Lord is continually increasing.”

Your countrymen, my dear sir, have a saying from which we learn, that “whoso shall make of himself a sheep, will be sure to find wolves ready to devour him,” and all experience proves that such is certainly the case with regard not only to men, but also to communities of men. In the world of international commerce, England has always played the part of wolf, while seeking to induce the other nations to take that of sheep—permitting her to make of her little island the one and only “workshop of the world,” to which all other communities were to be compelled to send their products in their rudest forms, to be there changed in form, *and there taxed*. Foremost and firmest in resistance to this oppressive system has been France. Other nations that hitherto have been disposed to play the part of sheep, have recently followed her good example, and with such effect that they appear now to be grouping themselves together for the purpose

of making that resistance more effectual; but that any such action on their part can be construed into an admission of the truth of the British free trade doctrine, neither you nor I can readily believe. The ends they have sought to attain have been—first, a development of the power of association and combination among their own people; second, a development of agriculture consequent upon the creation of a domestic market for the products of the farm; and third, an assertion of their right to determine for themselves the form in which their products should be exported; and it has been for the purpose of carrying those views into full effect that they have had recourse to protective measures. British free trade, on the contrary, desires to *prevent* the growth of association everywhere, while dictating to all the world the forms in which their exports shall be made; and in the pursuit of that policy England has exhibited a steadiness and determination that is wholly without a parallel in history. That she has recently abandoned certain portions of her programme is very certain; but as I propose, my dear sir, to show you, not a single step in that direction has ever yet been taken that has not been forced upon her by the protective measures of other nations.

Prohibiting her colonists from bringing to her markets, except in their rudest form, any of their products, she thereby prohibited them from combination among themselves, while subjecting them to a taxation for transportation, for changes of form, for exchanges, and for the support of government, so oppressive as to take from the poor producer, as then estimated by British merchants, more than two-thirds of the total product of his land and labor. Prohibiting them from converting their rude products into commodities required for even their own especial use, she thus increased the quantity requiring to be transported to her markets, to be there converted, exchanged, and taxed. Prohibiting them from the use of any ships except her own, she thus compelled them to pay to her, and to her alone, the enormous amount required for the transport of so much bulky freight. Prohibiting the export of machinery, and the emigration of artisans, she thus denied to them, and to the world at large, the power to profit of the great discoveries in regard to steam, and to other of the great natural forces, that had then been made. Prohibiting, to the utmost extent of her ability, combination everywhere, she compelled Germany to send her wool—Russia to send her hemp and flax—India and Carolina to send rice and cotton—Jamaica and Brazil to send their sugar in its rudest state—each and every of these commodities being subjected to the payment of heavy duties on their entry into her ports, preparatory to their re-exportation in a finished form to the countries in which they had been produced. Occasionally, and only occasionally, her tributaries were permitted to feed some slight portion of the artisans she thus

employed. Taxes on the food they sent were added to those on raw materials of manufacture, and the enormous amount thus raised was then appropriated to the maintenance of fleets and armies employed in coercing the producers of food and raw materials into submission to a system more tyrannical, more destructive of morals, more antagonistic to civilization, and more in opposition to all the teachings of Adam Smith, than any other that had existed from the creation of the world.

With time, however, there came resistance—this country setting the example of a determination to compel the recognition of equality on the ocean; a movement that was followed by repeal of the obnoxious provisions of the Navigation Laws. Following in the same direction, we find our protective tariff of 1828 compelling the disappearance of the tax on cotton—that of Russia, of 1825, doing the same by the taxes on flax and hemp—that of Germany, doing it in regard to wool—and our own highly protective tariff of 1842 giving the *coup de grace* to the restriction on the import of food. Thenceforth, all foreign nations were to be permitted to bring the raw products of their various soils, and to have them so changed in form as to fit them for consumption, without the payment of any direct tax for the support of the British government—the indirect taxation to which they were subjected, enormous as it was, being held to be entirely sufficient.

Such is the history of the rise and progress of British free trade—every step in that direction having been forced upon the people of England by the adoption of measures of resistance, in the form of tariffs adopted with the view of carrying into effect your own grand idea of *acclimating among the nations of the earth each and all the various branches of manufacture*, and thus familiarizing them “with the working of metals and of mines, with the various departments of mechanics, and with the art of navigation.” For the accomplishment of that great object, the governments of those several countries had not been forced to resort to any “abuse of power.” On the contrary, they had, my dear sir, to use your own words, only “performed a positive duty in seeking to take possession of all the various branches of industry whose acquisition was authorized by the nature of things,” and they were being in part rewarded by the emancipation of their people from a taxation of the most oppressive kind. Having protected their people, they had ceased to “make of themselves sheep,” and the danger of becoming a prey to wolves had almost disappeared.

That protection is the one and only road towards freedom of international intercourse, is proved by all the occurrences of the last thirty years. Were further proof of this here required, it would be found in the fact that the idea of reciprocity is found in none of the arrangements of England with those states which are either

unable or unwilling to protect themselves—those which furnish sugar and tea, coffee and tobacco.

Of the amount paid by the people of England for sugar, no less than £5,000,000 is taken by the public treasury. Were there no such claim, the quantity of money expended on sugar would not be in any manner diminished—the consumption growing with a reduction of price that would enable both producer and consumer to profit of the change. The effect of this would soon exhibit itself in a rise in the price of the whole crop, giving to the whole body of producers probably six, eight, or even ten millions of pounds per annum more than they now obtain. Such being the case, does England, in her anxiety for reciprocity, propose to accept sugar from its producers at the same low rate of duties at which she desires them to receive her cloth and iron? Not at all! On the contrary, one of the essential objects of that war which is so well described in the public document given in my last, is that of compelling the people of the tropics to devote their exclusive attention to the sugar culture—to increase the quantity thrown upon her market—to diminish the price and increase the consumption—and thus to enable her to take a constantly increasing proportion of the product for the maintenance of her government. Anxious to sell cloths, she makes a war upon China which closes with a treaty providing for the admission of cottons and woollens at very low duties, but without the slightest suggestion of remission of any part of that enormous proportion of the price paid by the British public for tea (£5,000,000) which is now required for public purposes. So, too, with tobacco, which pays another £5,000,000, nearly every shilling of which comes from the pockets of men who are surrounded by great deposits of coal and iron ore which they cannot work, because of the “determination of British iron-masters to destroy competition, and to gain and keep foreign markets;” and who are, therefore, compelled to devote their labor to the raising of rude products for the British market. Professedly anxious for freedom of trade, she so discriminates—or quite recently has so discriminated—against refined sugar from her colonies, as to compel her own subjects to send their products to her ports in their rudest state. Anxious, too, for reciprocity, when it suits her purpose, she urges with all her force a treaty between this country and Canada, and yet refuses to permit the formation of a treaty of reciprocity between her colonists of the West Indies and those of her possessions on this continent. Such, my dear sir, is the character of British free trade practice—each and every step toward any real freedom having been forced upon the government by the adoption by other nations of policies closely resembling that which France has so long pursued, and to which you have affixed your seal in the treaty so lately made. Such being its character, and there being

now—as always heretofore—a manifest determination to “overwhelm all foreign competition,” and to accomplish this by means of a warfare of the most destructive kind, can we regard Great Britain, with all her free trade professions, as any other than the wolf she always has been, although now appearing in the clothing of the sheep? As it appears to me, it is quite impossible that we should do so.

By Englishmen generally this suggestion may be regarded as most unjust, and for the reason, that they have so long been accustomed to judge of every measure by its probable effect upon their own trade, their own profits, their own manufactures, and their own power, as to have become almost entirely incapable of occupying any other stand point whatsoever. As a consequence of this it is, that, to use the words of your most distinguished countryman, De Tocqueville:—

“In the eyes of the English, that which is most useful to England is always the cause of justice. The man or the government which serves the cause of England has all sorts of good qualities; he who hurts those interests, all sorts of defects, so that it would seem that the *criterion* of what is noble, or just, is to be found in the degree of favor or opposition to English interests. The same thing occurs to some extent in the judgments of all nations, but it is manifested in England to a degree that astonishes a foreigner. England is often accused on this account of a political machiavellism which, in my opinion, not only does not exist any more, but rather less than elsewhere.”

The real charge to be brought against her is not machiavellism, but selfishness such as is above so well described, and which wholly unfits her for taking the lead in the work of organization in which your own country, my dear sir, seems now to be so well engaged. Of all the countries of the world, England is the one that has the fewest real friends, and hence it is that she has so entirely lost her hold on Europe. How she stood, a year since, on this continent, even among those who are now soliciting her aid for the destruction of this Union, may be seen from the following extract from a speech of Mr. Jefferson Davis, now at the head of the, so-called, Confederate States, delivered in the Senate of the United States, less than eighteen months since:—

“This English teaching, this English philanthropy, is to us what the wooden horse was at the siege of Troy. It has its concealed evil. It looks, I believe, to the separation of these States; the ruin of the navigating and manufacturing States, who are their rivals; not the Southern States, who contribute to their wealth and prosperity. Yet, strange as it may seem, there only do the seeds they scatter take root. British interference finds no footing, receives no welcome among us of the South. We turn with loathing and disgust from their mock philanthropy.”

Towards France, as I believe, there exists no such feeling as that which is here exhibited, in any portion of the world; and for the reason, that her position in the world of commerce has always

been that of the sheep which has desired to protect herself, and not that of the wolf desiring to prey upon the sheep. The results of this now exhibit themselves in the facts, that by means of a protective system more stringent and more steadily maintained than any other in the world, she has been enabled to obtain the admission into the British markets of many of the most important products of her vast and varied industry, while retaining for herself that thorough protection for her own manufactures which had before been promised by the Council of State; and, that she is becoming from day to day more fully enabled, by means of the reciprocity system, to bring to act in concert with her, those of the countries of continental Europe whose policy has recently been most in accordance with her own—thereby bringing the sheep to act together, and thus enabling them more thoroughly to repel the wolf's attacks. The idea is a grand one—it being the organization of Europe at large in opposition to that system which looks to having but a single workshop for the world. Fully carried out, it cannot fail to result in placing France in the lead of both the political and the commercial world.

French commercial policy tends thus to the production of union between France and the advancing communities of the earth, and brings with it, as you so properly say in your Address, “the thought of mutual approximation and of harmony among the most civilized nations”—that is, of those nations which have most adopted your own admirable ideas as to the duty imposed on governments so to act as to secure the taking possession of all the various branches of industry for which they are fitted, and thus to promote that diversification in the pursuits of their people which is required for the production of harmony within, and strength for resistance to all attacks from without. British policy, on the contrary, tends to the prevention of any movement in that direction, and hence it is, that in all the nations subject to it, we witness nothing but growing discord at home, with steady decline in the power for self-defence, the latest proof of this being furnished in the recent history of these United States; the Germanic Union, on the contrary, furnishing the most conclusive evidence of the advantages to be derived from moving in the direction indicated by France.

Thirty years since, Northern Germany presented to view a congeries of independent states, various in their sizes and widely different in their modes of thought and action. Small as they were, each had its little custom-houses, and, as a necessary consequence, there was but little domestic commerce, and absolutely no common bond of union. Prohibited by England from obtaining machinery, their people found themselves compelled to send their food and their wool to that country in search of the spindle and the loom, and there to submit to severe taxation as a condition precedent to the

conversion of the two into cloth, to be then returned to the place from whence the materials had come, and to be worn by those to whose labors their production had been due. Food and wool were, of course, very cheap, while cloth was very dear, and the farmer very badly clothed. A better day, however, was then close at hand—stern necessity having compelled the formation of new arrangements which gradually took the form of a great Customs Union—embracing 35,000,000 of people—within which commerce was to be absolutely free. Without its limits trade was to be subjected to such restrictions as were deemed to be required for carrying into effect the grand idea of “acclimating” among the German people “the principal branches of industry,” and “adding to woollens and cottons all that might be required for rendering them familiar with the working of metals and mines, and with the arts of navigation”—in full accordance with the ideas that you, my dear sir, have so well expressed. Under the system thus inaugurated, the people gradually grew in strength and power—each and every stage of their growth being attended by a disappearance of some of the restrictions under which they before had suffered. First, came permission to purchase machinery in England. Next, the English duties on wool disappeared. Again, the market of England was opened to their food. With each successive stage of progress towards commercial freedom, there came a diminution in the necessity for exporting raw materials, and an increase in the power to export finished commodities, with steady increase in the prices of food and wool as compared with those of cloth and iron, and a constant increase in the productiveness and value of German labor and land. With each, there came an increased desire for the formation of a closer and more intimate union than that which then existed. With each, the government grew in strength for resistance to aggression from abroad—that strength having, within the last three years, manifested itself to an extent that could scarcely have been anticipated, even by those who had most carefully studied the Germanic movement. Here, as everywhere, my dear sir, enlightened protection has proved to be the road towards strength and independence.

Thirty years since, the American Union exhibited a scene of prosperity, the like of which had never been known—a thoroughly protective tariff having largely aided in developing the industry of the country, while so rapidly filling the public treasury as, three years later, to compel the entire extinction of the public debt. Always turbulent, South Carolina was then as anxious for a dissolution of the Union as she has recently proved herself to be, but so strong was then the attachment to the Union that she could find no second. Three years later, the British free trade system was re-inaugurated; and since then, with the exception only of the years from 1842 to 1847, our course has been dictated

to us by the class of men which thrives upon the profits of transportation, and desires, therefore, that all our products shall be exported in the most bulky form. Fifteen years have now elapsed since we last abandoned that policy to the steady pursuit of which France owes her present strength. With each and every of those years, the relations of American slavery and British free trade have been becoming more close and intimate. With each, there has been an increasing alienation of the several portions of the Union, and for the simple reason, that with each there has been a diminution of the power to maintain domestic commerce, accompanied by an increase in the necessity for looking to England as the only outlet for those rude products of our soil which we have not been allowed to manufacture. Having thus made of ourselves sheep, the wolf stands now ready to devour us so soon as a fitting opportunity for so doing shall be presented. Anxious to pass from that position, and to take once more our true one, we have now established the Morrill tariff, and although, as a protective measure, it is but a very feeble imitation of your own, as well as of those to which your German and Belgian neighbors owe their present wealth and strength, it cannot fail, as I think, ultimately to bring about a state of things that shall fit us for association, on a footing of reciprocity, with all those civilized countries where the plough, the loom, and the anvil are made to work together.

The raising of raw material for distant markets is the proper work of slaves and savages, and yet it is to that work to which British policy would restrict the nations of the world. Hence it is, that slavery and British free trade have, in this country, always worked together, and hence, too, it is, that there is, at this moment, so strong a pro-southern tendency in the general British mind. The more the tendency towards converting those raw products into finished commodities—the greater the tendency towards the adoption of your own most excellent doctrines—the greater becomes the power of both communities and individuals to rise from the condition of slaves to that of freemen. French, German, and Belgian policies look in that direction, and hence it is that there is so general a pro-northern tendency in the mind of Continental Europe. That in this respect your feelings are in full accord with those of your countrymen generally, I feel very certain, and therefore it is, that I cannot but hope that further examination of our recent tariff may lead you to the conclusion that its authors are entitled to the gratitude of every friend of civilization and of freedom.

That there is a perfect harmony of all real, permanent, and well understood international interests, I feel well assured, and equally well am I satisfied that the day is not far distant when you, and all other of the enlightened men of continental Eu-

rope, must arrive at the conclusion, that the interests of their respective countries, as well as those of freedom, would, in the past, have been much promoted by our permanent adoption of the policy of which France has so long been the chief exponent, and by our absolute and determined rejection of that barbarizing system which England seeks to force upon a reluctant world—and that in the establishment of our present tariff, we have made a move in the right direction.

Begging you to excuse my several trespasses upon your kind attention, and hoping that you may live to see the time when the whole of continental Europe shall be united in the formation of such a protective union as appears to be indicated by your Address, I remain, my dear sir, with great esteem and regard,

Yours, very truly,

HENRY C. CAREY.

MONS. MICHEL CHEVALIER.

PHILADELPHIA, October 31, 1861.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

<p>RECEIVED MAIN LOAN DESK LD-URL APR 12 1965 MAR 22 1965 2 9 9 10 11 12 1</p>	<p>REC'D LD-URL AUG 27 1985 SEP 03 1985 REC'D LD-URL JUN 21 1986 AUG 30 1975 SEP 8 1975 DISCHARGE-URL APR 6 1981</p>	
--	--	--

Form L9-50m-7, '54 (5990) 444

PHOTOMOUNT
PAMPHLET BINDER

~
Manufactured by
GAYLORD BROS. Inc.
Syracuse, N.Y.
Stockton, Calif.



3 1158 00671 0643

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 001 165 007 4

